

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Faith Treinka Walker,	)	Case No. 6:22-cv-01414-DCC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
Universal Health Services and the	)	
Carolina Center for Behavioral Health,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Complaint alleging causes of action pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. ECF No. 1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On July 11, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice and without issuance of service of process. ECF No. 20. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if she failed to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections and the time in which to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice and without issuance of service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

August 30, 2022  
Spartanburg, South Carolina